

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
CHARLOTTE DIVISION  
CIVIL NO. 3:04cv468**

**SIRRITHA L. BROWN, on behalf of**     )  
**S.L.,,**     )

**Plaintiff,**     )

**vs.**     )

**JO ANNE B. BARNHART,**     )  
**Commissioner of Social**     )  
**Security Administration,**     )

**Defendant.**     )

**ORDER**

---

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 9), filed September 28, 2005; Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 10) and Memorandum in Support of the Commissioner's Decision (Doc. No. 11), both filed November 17, 2005; and the Magistrate Judge's Memorandum and Recommendation ("M&R") (Doc. No. 12), filed April 25, 2006. The Magistrate Judge recommended that Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment be denied, Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment be granted, and the Commissioner's decision be affirmed. The time for filing objections has since passed, and neither Plaintiff nor Defendant filed objections in this matter. For the reasons stated below, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, GRANTS Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, and AFFIRMS the Commissioner's decision.

**I. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), United States Magistrate Judge Carl Horn III was designated to consider and recommend disposition of Plaintiff's and Defendant's Motions for


Summary Judgment. The Federal Magistrate Act provides that “a district court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specific proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). “By contrast, in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

## II. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, after a careful review of the record in this case, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge’s findings of fact are supported by the record and the conclusions of law are consistent with and supported by current case law. See Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982) (holding that only a careful review is required in considering a memorandum and recommendation absent specific objections). Thus, the Court hereby accepts the M&R of Magistrate Judge Horn and adopts it as the final decision of this Court for all purposes relating to this case.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment is **DENIED**, Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED**, and the Commissioner’s decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Signed: July 26, 2006

  
Frank D. Whitney  
United States District Judge

